DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 094 SO 010 426

AUTHOR Tamminga, Harriet L.
TITLE Past and Present School System Response to Asian Immigrants.
PUB DATE Sep 77
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Chicago, Illinois, September 5-9, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; *Asian Americans; Bias; Chinese Americans; Cultural Differences; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Disadvantagement; *Educational History; Educational Legislation; Educational Objectives; *Educational Policy; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; Ethnic Studies; *Immigrants; Japanese Americans; Language of Instruction; Negative Attitudes; Relevance (Education); Social Discrimination; Vietnamese

ABSTRACT

Acculturation of Asian immigrants to American life through participation in public education is influenced by school system ideology, goals, and implementation of goals. School system response to Asian immigrants to the United States in the early 20th century was characterized by assimilationist ideology and by goals emphasizing social mobility and Americanization. However, these goals were ambiguous regarding children of Japanese and Chinese immigrants and discrimination against Asian pupils was not unusual. Goal implementation varied by school system and there was a general lack of remedial programs to meet special needs stemming from linguistic and cultural differences. Vietnamese refugee children in the middle 1970's, in contrast, are entering school systems which are influenced by federal and state legislation to recognize and enforce cultural pluralism, provide special help for non-English speaking children, and provide curriculum relevant to minority children. Goal implementation still varies, however, depending upon degree of commitment of school authorities and resources available. Data about educational policies of school districts in Colorado is presented as an example of the recent trend to include ethnic studies in the curriculum, to reinforce ethnic identity, and to encourage minority participation in society. The conclusion is that changes in school system response to Asian immigrants from 1900 to the present are due in large part to state and federal influence on local school system policy. (Author/DB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED146094

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Harriet Tamminga

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

# PAST AND PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM RESPONSE TO ASIAN IMMIGRANTS*

By

Harriet L. Tamminga, Ph.D.
Department of Sociology
University of Denver

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Sociological Association, Chicago, Illinois
September 5-9, 1977

SP 010 426

PAST AND PRESENT SCHOOL SYSTEM RESPONSE TO ASIAN IMMIGRANTS

Today, as in the early decades of this century, education is generally viewed as one of American society's most important institutions for bringing about the acculturation or assimilation of immigrants. Schooling is often credited with changing foreigners who have settled in this country into Americans, and with making possible the social mobility of immigrants who came to the United States in the 19th and early 20th centuries (Tyack, 1967; Greer, 1972). The purpose of this study is to compare school system response to Asian immigrants to this country in the early decades of this century with the response of contemporary school systems to a group of recent immigrants from Southeast Asia, the refugees from Vietnam.

The fundamental organizational structure of urban school systems was set by the turn of the century, and has remained essentially unchanged ever since; educational systems then, like now, were centralized, bureaucratized, racist, and class-biased, according to Katz (1971). However, this study of school system response to past and present Asian immigrants reveals some changes which are indicative of an important trend occurring in American education today: the trend toward the reduction of autonomy in local school governance, as more policy-making occurs at the Federal and State levels and more influence is exerted by ethnic and other interest groups beyond the local level. This change is reflected in a modification of school system ideology, goals, and goal implementation concerning immigrant education. Following

a brief description of Asian immigration, similarities and differences in these three aspects of school system response will be considered. The discussion is based on sociological and historical analyses of early twentieth century and present-day urban school systems, and upon data about the fourteen school districts in the Denver metropolitan area and information from the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Colorado State Department of Education, and other agencies concerned with programs for Vietnamese refugees.

Asian Immigration

During the period of massive immigration between 1815 and 1915, over thirty-five million people came to America from countries throughout the world (Vander Zanden, 1972). A relatively small number of these newcomers were from Asia; in 1900, only .27% of the population of the United States was Chinese or Japanese, and by 1970, Japanese, Chinese, and Filiipinos, the only Asians listed in the census, constituted just .67% of the total population (Liu and Yu, 1975).[1]

There were approximately 35,000 Chinese immigrants in the United States in 1860, and the number rose to just over 107,000 in 1890, but return migration, shortage of females, and restrictions imposed by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, caused a decrease for the next thirty years, so that in 1920, there were fewer than 62,000. It was not until 1950, that the Chinese population in the U.S. again exceeded 100,000. New immigration provisions, such as the repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act in 1943, and a growing birth rate increased the number to 383,023 in 1970;[2] 47% of the total Chinese American population in 1970

were foreign-born (Liu and Yu, 1975; Lyman, 1974).

The Japanese population in the continental United States totaled slightly over 24,000 in 1900. The Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907 drastically curtailed immigration, and also, a large proportion of arrivals remigrated to Japan, so it was not until 1920 that there were over 100,000 Japanese on the American mainland.

Hostility toward Asians was evinced by denial of citizenship to them and by restrictions on immigration from China and Japan. The antipathy directed at other ethnically different groups (i.e., non-Anglo Saxon) especially following the influx of about ten million immigrants from eastern and southern Europe between 1882 and 1914, was coupled with American isolationist sentiment after World War I. This led to legislation in 1921 restricting immigration; the act was revised in 1924 to incorporate a quota system favoring northern and western Europeans and to bar Orientals from migrating to the U.S. (Vander Zanden, 1972). In 1952, a token quota was assigned to Japanese immigrants, and foreign-born Asians became eligible for naturalization. The 1970 census identified 373,983 Japanese in the mainland U.S., with 21% of the total Japanese population in America foreign-born (Peterson, 1971; Liu and Yu, 1975).

Only about one-third of all immigration is dictated by quotas. The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and later acts allowed refugees to enter this country regardless of quota, and legislation passed in 1965 gives preference to persons with certain skills or with relatives in the U.S. regardless of country of origin (Vander Zanden, 1972). After the fall of South Vietnam in April, 1975, the Indochinese Migration and Refugee Assistance

Act was passed to aid the refugees who fled from Southeast Asia following withdrawal of the American Troops. Under this act, over 135,000 Vietnamese refugees have come to the United States, and the number of Indochinese refugees is expected to reach 150,000, according to resettlement officials.

Early Twentieth Century School System Ideology

Ideology refers to a set of characteristic ideas, such as principles or purposes, that reflect social needs and aspirations and are justified by what are perceived as widely held values in society. In the early decades of this century, there was widespread belief in education as the means to promote assimilation of recent arrivals to the U.S. Assimilation refers to the social process through which culturally and socially diverse groups become fused together into one social unit with a common culture; the resulting entity may range somewhere on a continuum between the "melting pot" at one end (i.e., a bilateral fusion of differing groups that results in a new culture) to the opposite end of the continuium, a monocultural society where one group is dominant and the other disappears (Vander Zanden, 1965:306). Although some people favored the "melting pot" as the outcome of assimilation, there is little evidence that school ideology was affected (Church, 1976:274). Instead, adherence to the ideology of "Anglo-conformity" was pervasive in urban school systems; this ideology assumed the desirability of maintaining English institutions, language and culture (Gordon, 1972). Nineteenth century textbooks emphasized Protestant values, and contained harsh stereotypes of Catholic, Jewish, and other

immigrant groups. National unity, characterized by consensus on moral, political, and economic issues was a consistent theme.

Prior to the last decades of the nineteenth century, decentralized urban school systems with "democratic localism" made it possible for bilingual and bicultural schooling to be offered in public schools in some ethnic neighborhoods (Katz, 1971:15). However, by the turn of the century, urban school systems had become centralized and bureaucratized, and ethnic group influence on local school policy had waned, as Progressives assumed greater control of urban politics and of school governance (Church, 1976; Lazerson, 1975). Liberal progressives called for immigrant adjustment to be accomplished without depriving immigrants of Old World cultures, but conservative progressives, who were more influential, expected schools to impose Anglo, Protestant, middle class values, and stressed Americanization of immigrants (Church, 1976:258). The aim of the Americanization movement, at its height during World War 1, was to strip immigrants of their native culture and to make them conform to American values (Gordon, 1974). It was believed that by teaching immigrants the English language and about the American political system, they could be expected to assume the responsibilities of citizenship (Cohen, 1969).

The product of acculturation and assimilation was expected to be a monocultural and monostructural society, with a hierarchy of Americanism that depended upon how closely newcomers approximated national identity and were economically successful (Lazerson, 1975). Various ethnic groups were ranked in the hierarchical structure of society according to their similarity

in color and culture to native Americans (the term used in the early twentieth century to refer to Protestant Anglos born in the United States). Since the more divergent an ethnic group, the lower its rank, Asian immigrants were generally seen as aliens occupying the bottom of the hierarchy. They were viewed by many Americans as so different that it would be impossible to assimilate them into American society (Carlson and Colburn, 1972). This belief was reflected in, and reinforced by, national legislation and federal court decisions during this period that denied citizenship to Chinese and Japanese immigrants, failed to protect their civil rights, and subjected them to various kinds of discrimination (Wu, 1972). School ideology incorporated anti-integration sentiment that was particularly evident in California where a majority of the Asian immigrants lived, and in Southern states, where the segregation of Chinese was upheld by a Supreme Court decision in 1927(Carlson and Colburn, 1972).

Early Twentieth Century School System Goals

Urban school systems are formal organizations, oriented to the achievement of specific goals, which means that schools are oriented to the production of output that constitutes input for other social systems (see Gottshalk, 1973, for a discussion of the specific goal achievement orientation of formal organizations). School system goals concern the provision of "education" to be utilized by economic, political, and other societal subsystems. A school's goals, i.e., the kind of education it seeks to provide, may place relatively more stress upon either instrumental socialization or on expressive socialization, depending upon

various factors, such as level of the school, or pupil sex or social class (Bidwell, 1974:271). Instrumental socialization is the acquisition of information and skills necessary for enacting specified social roles; to accomplish this, the curriculum centers on differentiated subject areas, and sanctions, such as grades, provide incentives for student performance. Expressive socialization, on the other hand, is the development of beliefs and various forms of sensibility; this is incorporated in a curriculum differentiated according to student maturity and social background, with acceptance of the teachers' moral authority as incentives for student performance. These two kinds of education are tied to different aspects of social stratification - instrumental socialization to occupations and expressive socialization to life style (Bidwell, 1974:273).

In the early decades of this century, public education was popularly equated with social cohesion and social mobility (Lazerson, 1975). The common experience of diverse children in urban schools was expected to offer the "wherewithal for responsible citizenship and economic prosperity", while also serving as a selective process enabling only certain students to succeed (Greer, 1972:80). So, the kind of education stressed in different schools varied, but early twentieth century school system goals were to provide instrumental socialization to facilitate social mobility and expressive socialization to promote social cohesion.

Through instrumental socialization, literacy, language skills, behavioral traits, and vocational training, might be acquired to make individual economic progress possible. By

differentially distributing the tools for enacting varying social roles to different pupils, instrumental socialization became a sorting mechanism. Offering the means for social mobility to individuals ostensibly selected on the basis of merit provided a remedy for social inequality that did not disturb the existing social structure or necessitate a redistribution of priviledge (Cohen, 1969). Thus, in this sense the schools were (and are) class biased, as Katz (1971) argues.

Also emphasized in school system goals early in the century was expressive socialization to promote Americanization. Patriotism and allegiance to the U.S. and its institutions were stressed, and social cohesion was expected to result from the inculcation of common beliefs, attitudes and values. Thrift, cleanliness, punctuality, honesty, and other middle class virtues were held up as models. Because school personnel distrusted the background of immigrant children, the schools aimed at starting from scratch to remold previous beliefs, and implant "correct" ideas and behavior (Tyack, 1967).

Orientation to the achievement of these school system goals was undoubtedly ambiguous in schools attended by Japanese or Chinese pupils, and especially in segregated Oriental public schools. Along with an emphasis on good citizenship, patriotism, and American values may have been recognition of the alien status, or second class citizen status of Chinese and Japanese Americans, who were denied the legal and political guarantees afforded to other citizens. Accompanying the expressive socialization aimed at Americanization of other immigrant pupils was likely to be re

rejection of Japanese or Chinese assimilation into American society or belief that the Asian immigrants were loyal to a foreign power. Instrumental socialization was likely to focus on preparation for enacting social roles that Asian immigrants were expected to fill (i.e., certain lower status occupations); or the schools' emphasis on social mobility through instrumental socialization might be coupled with the belief that mobility possibilities for Chinese or Japanese were limited to within the confines of their ethnic subcommunities.

Early Twentieth Century School System Goal Implementation

Sociological analyses of formal organizations have pointed out that statements of organizational goals may exert little control over the actions of organizational participants; rather than assuming that incumbents of organizational positions passively follow a clear and consistent set of goals, the degree of correspondence between organizational goals and behavior is analytically problematic (Drabek and Chapman, 1973). Guided by assimilationist ideology concerning education as the means to promote immigrant assimilation into Anglo-dominated American society, early twentieth century school systems were oriented to the achievement of goals that emphasized instrumental socialization to facilitate social mobility, and expressive socialization to promote Americanization. Although school system ideology and goals regarding Asian immigrants were more ambiguous than for other immigrant groups, because of legally sanctioned discrimination against Japanese and Chinese immigrants, Americanization and economic progress were still predominant themes in

school goals. However, school system goals did not necessarily determine whether or how these goals were implemented by school systems in the early decades of this century.

School governance during the early decades of the twentieth century was based on the principle of localism, which argued that local officials should establish educational policy and control school activities. This doctrine, accepted by the general public, was expounded by professional educators, school board members, and state legislators, who believed that differences in local community characteristics made local autonomy necessary. Although the provision of public education was a state function, according to the constitution, so that the state government had ultimate authority over local school districts, responsibility for school governance was generally delegated to local school districts (Meranto, 1970). Thus, school policies and programs to implement school system goals were locally dictated and funded.

The efforts of public schools to provide instrumental socialization to facilitate social mobility were not universally applied. Instead, schools reflected and reinforced the cultural background and economic status of pupils. Although public education was credited with making possible the inclusion in the middle class of the vast majority of early twentieth century immigrants, immigrant success is a legend, Greer contends (1972:83). More children failed than succeeded, relatively and absolutely, in the schools (Greer, 1972:106). In effect, public education served as a social sorting device, with most poor children performing poorly, and most well to do children retaining

or improving their advantage (Katz, 1971:110). Education differed for pupils from different social classes, based on their parents' status and on their presumed future status (Church, 1976:428).

> The arrival of large numbers of immigrant pupils coincided with the emergence of I.Q. and achievement testing, vocational guidance, and the movement to diversify instruction and curriculum in city schools. There is more than a little evidence that these practices were employed - if not conceived - as a way of providing the limited education schoolmen often thought suitable for children from the lower reaches of the social order. (Cohen, 1969:13)

Retardation rates, i.e., pupils below age grade, varied with nationality, according to school surveys in a number of cities in the first three decades of this century. The average retardation rate of 30% in 1909 had changed little in 1930; although the rate was lower for "native Americans" (i.e., Anglo origin citizens, as the term was then applied), it was nearly double for certain immigrant groups. Retardation rates showed an inverse relationship with the length of time immigrants had been exposed to American culture and language, but effects of length of residence differed among various nationalities. Cohen (1969:12) concludes that available evidence indicates that immigrant pupils, especially of certain nationalities, were more likely than native Americans to have higher retardation rates, lower IQ scores, and were much less likely to stay in high school.

High rates of school failure, low rates of literacy, and high retardation rates were blamed on non-English-speaking parents and on the nature of the pupils enrolled in certain schools, not on school practices or personnel (Greer, 1972:125). However, the

teaching of English and literacy skills, fundamental to preparation for filling higher status occupational and social roles, was frequently inadequate to meet the needs of non-English speaking children. "At the outset of the twentieth century, there was little or no research available on teaching English as a second language, on citizenship education, or on teaching the so-called culturally disadvantaged. There were no national funds available and few states offered a subsidy to towns and cities faced with the problems of immigrant education." (Durin, 1974:102)

Characteristically, language was a fundamental problem faced by immigrant children, who spoke a foreign language at home, but were taught only in English at school. By World War I, most states had passed laws requiring English as the language of instruction in the schools. Imposition of English was correlated with prevailing attitudes toward various ethnic groups; for politically and socially acceptable groups, bilingualism was acceptable, but harsh restrictions were imposed on the use of languages of groups viewed with hostility or rejection (Leibowitz, 1971). Language restrictions always occurred in conjunction with other discriminatory practices, as evidenced by the insistence on the use of English in San Francisco schools, the harassment of private Japanese language schools by public education officials, and the 1906 San Francisco Board of Education resolution ordering all Japanese and Chinese children to attend the segregated Oriental school (Leibowitz, 1971).

Children of immigrant families who spoke Chinese at home

were not likely to gain the familiarity with English necessary to benefit from classroom activities; they were handicapped in school examinations, class discussions, and relationships with teachers and other students (Wu,1972:215). Chinese youth were sensitive about their abilities to use English, since they spoke Chinese at home and in the Chinese language school, and often received insufficient or inadequate training in English in the public schools (Lyman,1974:115). The language problems in school were comparable for children of Japanese immigrants, who spoke Japanese at home and in the Japanese language school. However, in the 1930's, the children of Japanese immigrants were equal to Caucasian students in IQ and academic achievement, despite a poor command of English stemming from their home environments and sometimes, from the more or less segregated schools they attended (Kitano,1969:23; Peterson,1971:113). From their parents, their ethnic community, and the public schools, Japanese American students absorbed an esteem for education and achievement (Conroy and Miyakawa,1972:214). Since 1940, the level of schooling attained by Japanese Americans has been higher than for any other race, including whites (Peterson,1971:113). Compared with other non-white minorities in 1970, the percentages of males 16 years and over who had finished high school were twice as high for Japanese (69.9%) and Chinese (62.2%) as for blacks (32%) and Mexican Americans (28.1%) (Liu and Yu,1975:367).

Early twentieth century school systems used various means of expressive socialization to promote Americanization of immigrant children. Textbooks stressed American, i.e., middle class,

values and ideas, and schools attempted to instill "proper" attitudes and behavior in immigrant children, who came from different cultural backgrounds. Often, the public schools were concerned with the sanitary and behavioral problems of immigrant pupils, rather than with their academic performance (Greer,1972: 120). Patriotism and good citizenship were emphasized, through plays about American heroes, lessons in American history, and patriotic songs and exercises. Hosokawa (1969:xiv) relates how, along with learning English, he memorized the pledge of allegiance, and learned about George Washington, when he started school just after the First World War. By the time he was in high school, he had a fierce love for the United States, its history and traditions, and shared the American dream. He concludes that the public schools shaped the children of Japanese immigrants, in thought and action, to the American image, far more thoroughly than others realized (Hosokawa, 1969:xvi).

Immigrant children were often caught in a conflict between school culture and ethnic culture at home, and for many, the public schools acted as a wedge separating them from their parents (Tyack, 1967). The amount of discrepancy between what was expected and rewarded by the culture of an immigrant group and what was demanded and rewarded by school authorities was a factor in the variation in school achievement of different ethnic groups (Lazerson,1975:18). For the children of Japanese immigrants, school values and ethnic and family values regarding education were similar. "There was much reinforcement for conformity. As is often the case in primary and secondary school, conformity was rewarded by good grades. And with good grades came approval from teachers, parents and peers

and from the entire ethnic community." (Kitano, 1969:24)

Acculturation of the children of Japanese and Chinese immigrants was promoted by the compatibility of ethnic cultural values and expressive socialization in the schools. Although Japanese society differed in social structure, customs, and religion from American society, the value systems were compatible in many respects, such as in the emphasis on politeness, respect for authority and parental wishes, duty to community, diligence, cleanliness and neatness, achievement of long range goals, and keeping up appearances (Caudill and DeVos,1966). The "bushido code", which stressed individual success and drive in all work, including educational pursuits, was basic to the traditional culture of the Japanese immigrants (Horinouchi,1967). Traditional values, rather than American middle class values, continue to explain the high achievement of Japanese-American pupils, a recent study suggests (Schwartz,1970). However, internalization of American perceptual norms and assimilation orientation increased for Chinese in America according to their progressive removal from ancestral culture, as measured by generation, citizenship, residence area, and social gaps (Fong,1965).

Assimilation of immigrants into a monocultural, monostructural society, dominated by white, Protestant,native Americans, and ranked according to the similarity to this group of each ethnic group, was the theme of school system ideology concerning immigrant education,during the early decades of the twentieth century. Each immigrant group was to be enabled by instrumental socialization in the public schools to rise to a higher status, or to otherwise find its place. Through expressive socialization, the cultural background of various immigrant groups was to be overcome, as the

different ethnic groups became Americanized, and as social cohesion was furthered.

Assimilation has several aspects: there can be behavioral assimilation, or acculturation, which means that an ethnic group shares and follows the values, goals, and expected behaviors of the dominant culture. This kind of assimilation, i.e., acculturation, characterizes the contemporary Japanese-Americans, the children and grandchildren of Japanese immigrants, who have been educated in the American public schools (Kitano, 1969:136) Structural assimilation, on the other hand, refers to the establishment of secondary relationships in the organizational, institutional, and civic life of the receiving society, and eventually, to primary relationships in social clubs, cliques, and marriage (Gordon,1972). Like Japanese-Americans, Chinese-Americans have progressed economically, and many have achieved middle class status and life styles, but also seek to retain a new ethnic consciousness (Lyman,1974:185). Thus, some aspects of early twentieth century school system goals have been realized, but the type of society assumed by school system ideology has not materialized. Neither Japanese or Chinese Americans are completely structurally assimilated; and instead, structural pluralism is a characteristic of American society today (Gordon,1972).

Present-Day School System Ideology

Acculturation into American society through education continues to be an important theme in the ideology of contemporary urban school systems, but as a result of the influence of developments in society over the past decade, cultural pluralism has

been incorporated in school system ideology as well. The concept of cultural pluralism is not new, but until recently, had relatively little effect upon school system ideology. In the late nineteenth century, Jane Addams, and the settlement house movement, assumed that imposing American middle-class values upon immigrants was wrong, and tried by means of various activities to advance the idea that different nationalities, cultures, and social classes should understand and respect each other (Church,1976:271). The desire of liberal progressives like Jane Addams to have local schools as centers of community organization, that represented the interests and needs of neighborhood residents, was frustrated by the conservative progressive reformers' success in centralizing urban school systems. "War zenophobia after 1915 made Americans even less tolerant of the 'different' values and cultures that liberal progressives hoped community control (of schools) would enhance." (Church,1976:284)

The melting pot and Anglo-conformity ideas of homogeneous culture were challenged by the ideology of culture pluralism, advocated by Kallen in 1915, and others in the 1930's and 40's, and by the triple melting pot theory of assimilation along religious lines, advanced in the mid- 1940's (Gordon,1972). However, studies indicating that ethnic groups had not been remolded in the white, middle-class American image, and various appeals for respect of cultural differences, made few inroads in school ideology. The traditional efforts of schools to instill homogeneous values and attitudes in children, teaching them that one way of doing things was superior to all others, rather than teaching children to value cultural differences and to respect those of different

backgrounds and beliefs, continued into the 1950's (Church,1976:458).

But, the civil rights movement in the 1960's brought a different kind of challenge to prevailing school system ideology. Confrontations between school officials and parents, civil rights groups, and minority communities occurred with increased frequency. Because of the relationship between education and poverty and social equality, school issues assumed an increased political significance. Local and national politicians, professional educators, and school administrators were forced to respond to civil rights demands for equal educational opportunity. Blacks and other minorities began to lay the blame on school characteristics, for the differential rates of school achievement and school failure of different ethnic groups, rather than assuming that group characteristics or social environment were at fault.

Ethnic identity became an important issue in the confrontation between the schools and the civil rights movement. Minority groups pressed for curriculum reforms, including minority history and ethnic studies, and asked that schooling be made relevant for minority children and contribute to their positive self-images and ethnic pride. "The black, Latino, and American Indian studies movements -and the group power movements of which they were a part- sparked a new interest in ethnic identity and cultural pluralism in the United States and led, in the late sixties and early seventies, to a new interest in the problem of cultural pluralism in the schools." (Church,1976:458) Recent articles in educational journals point to changes in attitudes toward ethnic and cultural diversity that have occurred in the past decade, but reflect the existence of resistence

to the ideology of cultural pluralism in the schools as well (c.f., Baker, 1976; Broudy, 1975; Arciniega, 1975).

Just what is meant by cultural pluralism is not always made clear by those who use the concept. The meaning of cultural pluralism implied by many advocates is that certain Old World material culture traits, such as foods, arts and crafts, costumes and holidays, are retained (as the recent revival of interest in ethnic heritage, different cultures, and folk traditions indicates). Meanwhile, language, normative expectations, customs,values, and other aspects of traditional non-material culture are expected to be disgarded, adapted to the dominant culture, or segmentalized, i.e., practiced in private but not in public.

Others emphasize that cultural pluralism involves equality of all ethnic groups in American society, so that people of different cultural backgounds, with different languages, values, and attitudes, are respected and treated equally. Regardless of the exact definition of cultural pluralism, the concept involves a recognition that the monocultural, monostructural entity, envisaged as the end product of Americanization of the millions of early twentieth century immigrants, has not materialized. Since assimilation presumes a homogeneous society as an end result, advocates of the ideology of cultural pluralism now speak of integration into society instead (Gordon,1972). Rather than a society with a single status hierarchy, where ethnicity and social status are synonymous, the advocates of cultural pluralism envisage a multicultural, structurally pluralistic society, where different social classes are represented in the structures of the various ethnic groups.

Present-Day School System Goals

School system goals, like school ideology, were affected by events of the 1960's and 70's. The traditional goal emphasis on the provision of instrumental socialization to facilitate the social mobility of individuals selected on the basis of merit (which in its application served as a social sorting mechanism, usually assuring the continuation of prior status) was challenged by the civil rights movement. The findings of educational researchers reinforced the contention of minorities that schools were not effective in breaking the poverty cycle and eliminating racial discrimination, even when school facilities were equal (c.f., Coleman, 1966). Civil rights proponents urged schools to compensate for the environmental disadvantages and social inequalities of the poor and the minorities, so that children of each social and ethnic group could be on equal footing in starting adult life (Church, 1976:453). Groups, rather than individuals, were the focus of their definition of what constituted equality of opportunity; they argued that

> Schools served the interests of equality and democracy only when they succeeded in teaching all their citizens the skills necessary to live in and compete in the modern world. This new definition did not reject Jeffersonian notions of competition and meritocracy so much as it demanded that the competitive, meritocratic selection process be postponed to the post school years. The school years should be used to bring all children up to a level that would allow all to enter the competitive, meritocractic selection process of adult life equally well prepared. (Church,1976:453)

Leaders of the educational profession enthusiastically claimed a major role for schools in helping to eliminate poverty; this opened to challenge some fundamental assumptions regarding schools as agents of equality and democracy. Previously, schools

were assumed to improve morality, conformity to American values, and efficiency of workers, but how successful schools were was difficult to measure. However, their promise to eliminate poverty was measurable in terms of the material success of school graduates (Church,1976:435-437). Thus, schools were under pressure to provide some demonstrable effect on improving economic status.

The new expectation, that equal educational opportunity for varying types of students involved unequal inputs, e.g., compensatory programs, to bring about equal outputs, required the expenditure of money that local school authorities were unable or unwilling to supply. So, federal funding was extended to local school districts, and the threat of withdrawal of funding was used to force compliance with federal stipulations regarding the provision of equal educational opportunity (Church,1976:447). Federal legislation, especially the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Federal Court decisions, state legislation, and actions of State Departments of Education mandated that schools be concerned with overcoming inequalities among different ethnic and social groups in academic achievement and future success. Now, school system goals were expected to emphasize instrumental socialization that facilitated equal chances for economic, social, and political participation in American society for all students, regardless of ethnicity or social status (Karabel and Halsey,1977:16).

Also, during this period, educational research began to point to a relationship between pupils' self-concepts and school performance, and schools were under pressure to improve achievement by creating positive identities for ethnic minorities. The stress in earlier school system goals on expressive socialization to

promote Americanization of different ethnic groups shifted to a focus on expressive socialization to promote ethnic identity and sense of individual self worth. Since school system goals direct the structure of rewards and reward allocations for teachers and students (Cave and Chesler,1974:368), changes in the reward structure were necessary. Previously, student behavior had to conform to middle class normative expectations to be rewarded with good grades and teacher approval; but, to enhance the self-concepts of children from culturally different backgrounds, their behavior was to be given positive sanctions as well. Also, changes in the curriculum were necessary, to increase its relevance and appeal to various ethnic groups, since the content of the curriculum represents school goals and norms in practice (Cave and Chesler, 1974:368). The curriculum was now expected to foster ethnic group pride and awareness, rather than to portray minority culture as inferior to the dominant culture, and to present multiethnic perspectives on social and historical events,in place of the unidirectional Anglo perspective of the past (Banks,1976; Cortes,1975).

Differences between the response of urban school systems to Asian immigrants early in the twentieth century, and school system response to the Vietnamese refugees in the 1970's, reflect these changes in school system goals. As an important aspect of the schools' emphasis on providing instrumental socialization to facilitate equal opportunity for participation in American society, contemporary school systems are expected to offer compensatory programs to overcome the language problems of Vietnamese children, rather than to impose English as the only language of instruction on children from non-English speaking homes. Through the presenta-

tion of a multiethnic perspective in the curriculum, expressive socialization in the schools is expected to help the Vietnamese children retain their ethnic identity and sense of individual self worth while becoming acculturated into American society.

Present Day School System Goal Implementation

The problems of non-English speaking or bilingual children in the schools attracted increased attention during the 1960's and 70's. At the National Education Association conference in 1966, instruction in Spanish was recommended for Spanish speaking students, and other professional teachers organizations joined with the NEA in helping to discredit the linking of English as the language of instruction with American values (Leibowitz,1971). Congress passed the Bilingual Education Act in 1967, which gave funds and support to bilingual programs. In 1970, a suit was filed in a U.S. District Court in San Francisco on behalf of Chinese speaking students, which asked that the school district provide bilingual education and English as a Second Language classes. The suit was denied, on the grounds that it was not required by law, but the decision was appealed, and on Jan.21,1974, the Supreme Court ruled, in what has become known as the Lau decision, that the failure of the school system to provide English language instruction to non-English speaking students results in the provision of unequal educational opportunity and is a violation of section of 601 of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Lau decision mandates Local Educational Agencies to provide remedies for non-English speaking children leading to oral proficiency, and later reading and writing skills in the class room.

As an example of what was occuring at the state level, the legislature of Colorado passed a Bilingual and Bicultural Education Act in 1975, that deals with the Lau issues. Funds were provided for tutorial programs for non-English speaking pupils, and school districts throughout the state were required to submit the results of a pupil survey that identified non-English speaking children, along with plans for teaching them. Thirty-four school districts, out of the total of 181 districts in the state, received state funding under the Non-English speaking Pupil Tutorial Program in 1975-76. (These funds were not applied to programs for the Vietnamese children, however, since there was federal funding available to the school districts for them.) The State Department of Education is following up on survey reports from the 181 school districts in Colorado, to check for accuracy and compliance with the state Bilingual and Bicultural Act. Possible negative sanctions for noncompliance include the threat of withdrawal of funding or of filing a case against the school district in federal court.

The survey of Colorado school districts indicates that of the 148 school districts which sent in results, 135 give attention to racist, ethnic, or sexist curriculum content, and minority contributions to society. Eighty-three school districts include ethnic studies in required social studies courses in high school, and ethnic studies are included in the curriculum of over 100 districts for elementary and middle schools. A national survey in 1974 of the 715 school districts in the country with 10,000 or more students indicated that 40% or 288 of these school

districts have ethnic studies curricula; the bulk of the programs were begun in 1969-1972, with fewer initiated since then, but in only a small proportion of the school districts are all or most students touched (Washburn, 1975).

Following the resettlement of the Indochinese refugees in the United States during 1975, Vietnamese children entered school systems in communities throughout the country. Various kinds of assistance were offered to local school systems with Indochinese refugee children by the Center for Applied Linguistics which established a clearinghouse to provide materials, specialists, and other kinds of help, and by the five Bilingual Resource Centers, which offered support to local school districts in the area of language materials and in-service training for teachers. State Education Agencies also offered technical assistance of various kinds to the local school districts, that was funded by the Indochinese Refugee Assistance Program. Under the Indochinese Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1975, the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare offered grants for transitional assistance to local school districts. Three hundred dollars per pupil was available to local school districts (or $600 per refugee pupil if the number exceeded 100 or 1% of the total school enrollment), and also, funds were made available to State Departments of Education, so that they could supply technical assistance to local school districts. By August, 1976, over 2100 school districts in all fifty states had submitted applications for funds. Under 100 refugee pupils were enrolled in 1,966 of these school districts, and refugee pupils constituted less than 1% of the total enrollment of these districts (24 of the districts were in Colorado). There were 43 school districts in various parts of the country which had over 100 Indochinese refugee pupils, constituting under 1% of the total enrollment (one of which was School District #1 in Denver, Colorado).

Vietnamese is the language spoken by the second highest number of non-English speaking children in the Denver public schools; Spanish is spoken by the largest number, but 20 other languages are also represented by non-English speaking pupils. There are 181 Vietnamese pupils in the central city school system, while the number of Vietnamese pupils in the other school districts in the Denver Metropolitan area range from two in one suburban district to 90 in another suburban district. Each of the fourteen school districts has an office or individual in charge of bilingual tutorial programs or English as a Second Language instruction, who do such things as provide teachers with materials, hold in-service training for teachers, co-ordinate the work of tutors or ESL specialists, and plan special activities, like summer school classes. These specialists report varying degrees of support from their communities, school administrators, and classroom teachers who have Vietnamese pupils in their classes, ranging from wide-spread interest and dedication to resistance and resentment. Obtaining money and personnel to provide the extent of programs necessary to meet the needs of non-English speaking pupils is a pervasive problem. Programs vary from half-day, everyday bilingual or ESL instruction, to sporadic or non-existent help for the Vietnamese children.

Conclusion

Past and present school system response to Asian Immigrants is summarized in Figure 1 on the next page. School system response to early twentieth century immigrants was characterized by assimilationist ideology. School system goals emphasized individual social mobility based on merit and social cohesion resulting from Americanization of foreign children. However, school system goals were ambiguous for children of Asian immigrants, since they were often regarded as unassimilable and not socially mobile. There was discrimination

Figure 1: School System Response to Asian Immigrants

Early Twentieth Century

| School System Ideology | School System Goals | School System Goal Implementation |
|---|---|---|
| Assimilation into: Anglo-dominant monocultural monostructural society | instrumental socialization to facilitate social mobility and to serve as sorting mechanism (with ambiguity in goals re: Asian immigrant children) | Localism in school governance coincided with variation in goal implementation. Language differences, school segregation, and discrimination were common problems for Asian immigrant children. Schooling facilitated intergenerational mobility thru high level of academic achievement of many Asian immigrant children. |
| | expressive socialization to promote Americanization and to further social cohesion | curriculum, textbooks, teachers stressed patriotism and American, i.e., middle class values. School culture and ethnic culture similar in values regarding education and behavior. Acculturation promoted; structural assimilation less widespread. |

Present-day

| School System Ideology | School System Goals | School System Goal Implementation |
|---|---|---|
| Integration into: multicultural structurally pluralistic society | instrumental socialization to facilitate political, social, and economic participation in society | Variation in goal implementation, but sanctions available to outside authorities may promote compliance with goals. Federal and State dictated and funded, tutorial, English as a Second Language, and bilingual programs for non-English speaking pupils. Availability of time, money, and trained personnel problematic; also resistance from some school officials, teachers, and dominant communities. |

Present-day

| School System Ideology | School System Goals | School System Goal Implementation |
|---|---|---|
| | expressive socialization to promote ethnic identity and sense of self worth | Multiethnic perspective supported by many teachers and curriculum specialists, as well as ethnic minority groups.<br>Ethnic studies included in curriculum of many school districts in last decade.<br>Impact of multiethnic studies and number of pupils affected problematic. |

in the way school system goals were implemented, and a lack of remedial programs to meet the special needs which stemmed from linguistic and cultural differences of children of Japanese and Chinese immigrants. But, after several generations, Asian Americans have attained a higher level of educational achievement than other nonwhite ethnic groups in the United States, and are generally acculturated into American society.

Vietnamese refugee children in the middle 1970's, in contrast, entered school systems that had been affected by events of the past decade. Notable are the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Supreme Court Lau decision, which mandated schools to provide special help for non-English speaking children, and Civil Rights demands for curriculum relevant to minority children. As a result, some characteristics of present day school system response to contemporary Asian immigrants differ from those of the past. Cultural pluralism has been incorporated in school ideology, along with the idea of acculturation. School systems today are expected to provide instrumental socialization to facilitate equal opportunity for full participation in American society by offering bilingual or English as a Second Language instruction to linguistically different pupils. Also, schools are expected to provide expressive socialization to enhance ethnic identity through ethnic studies and other curriculum reforms.

The extent to which different school systems with Vietnamese pupils implement these goals varies, however. Goal implementation depends upon such factors as the degree of commitment of local school authorities to the idea of providing unequal inputs to ensure equal outputs for culturally and linguistically different children; differences in school system resources (funds, materials, personnel, etc.); and priorities for resource allocation. In any case, there are constraints on local school system policies and programs concerning Vietnamese pupils, since state and federal authorities can exert

positive sanctions, e.g., funding, guidelines, expertise, and negative sanctions, e.g., threats of withdrawal of funding or legal actions.

It is too soon to assess what effect the change in school system response to contemporary Asian immigrants will have on the future level of educational achievement and acculturation of Vietnamese children[3]. But one effect of the change that is already apparent, is that it represents a movement away from local autonomy in school governance toward more policy decision-making by units outside of the local school system. This trend in school governance typifies what Warren (1972) describes as the increasing systemic relationships to the larger society of all local community subsystems. Before school system centralization in the late nineteenth century, neighborhood residents, such as geographically concentrated ethnic groups, were able to influence school policy in their subcommunity. After school system centralization and bureaucratization, ethnic group influence waned, as school policy for a whole urban community was mainly determined by system-wide local school authorities and city politicians or local civic elites. Ethnic group influence on local school policy increased again during the last decade, after becoming channeled through extracommunity units, such as the Federal Courts, State and Federal legislatures and agencies. As a result, the doctrine of localism in school governance, which has been deeply ingrained and widely held by educators and local community residents all through this century, has been affected. Although basic school system characteristics are comparable in many ways to those of early twentieth century school systems, the changes in school system response to Asian immigrants represent an important trend occurring in American education today: the trend toward erosion of the doctrine of localism and autonomy in local school governance, as more school policy-making occurs at the extracommunity level.

## Footnotes

* I wish to express my appreciation to Edith King and Thomas Drabek for their helpful comments on this paper.

1 "We, The Asian-Americans," a U.S. Bureau of the Census report, states that Asian-Americans constituted about 1% of the population of the United States in 1970. The total of 1,369,412 Asian-Americans included 591,290 Japanese-Americans, 435,062 Chinese-Americans, 343,060 Filipino-Americans, as well as Hawaiians, Koreans, Turkish, Lebonese, Israelis, Syrians, other Western Asians, Pakistanis, Indians, and other Asians. 90% of these Asian-Americans lived in urban areas, with about half concentrated in the three metropolitan areas of Honolulu, San Francisco-Oakland, and LosAngeles-Long Beach. Since a majority of the literature on Asian-Americans deals with Japanese and/or Chinese immigrants, these will be the groups to which this paper refers in the discussion of immigrant schooling in the early decades of this century.

2 This figure refers to the Chinese-American population on the mainland, as distinguished from the figure in footnote one which is the total for the United States, including Hawaii. This paper is concerned with mainland residents; since Hawaii was not a state during the first half of the century and conditions there differed from those on the mainland, most studies of Asian-Americans distinguish between the two places of residence of Japanese and Chinese immigrants.

3 How much of any difference between past and present Asian immigrant educational achievement and acculturation will be explained by differences in school system response, and how much by such variables as original culture, economic conditions, television, and sponsorship arrangements for Vietnamese refugees, is difficult to assess at this point.

REFERENCES


Arciniega, Tomas A.
1975 "The Thrust toward Pluralism: What Progress?" Educational Leadership 33 (Dec): 163-167.

Baker, Gwendolyn Calvert
1976 "Cultural Diversity: Strength of the Nation." Educational Leadership 33 (Jan): 257-260.

Banks, James A.
1976 "Ethnic Studies as a Process of Curriculum Reform." Social Education 40 (February): 76-80.

Bidwell, Charles E.
1974 "Students and Schools: Some Observations on Client Trust in Client-Serving Organizations." Pp. 252-278 in Cave and Chesler (ed.), Sociology of Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Broudy, Harry S.
1975 "Cultural Pluralism: New Wine in Old Bottles." Educational Leadership 33 (Dec): 173-175.

Carlson, Lewis H. and George A. Colburn
1972 In Their Place: White America Defines Her Minorities, 1850-1950. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Caudill, William and George De Vos
1966 "Achievement, Culture and Personality: the Case of the Japanese-American," Pp. 208-228 in Webster, Staton W. (ed.), the Disadvantaged Learner. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co.

Cave, William and Mark A. Chesler
1974 Sociology of Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Church, Robert L.
1976 Education in the United States. New York: The Free Press.

Cohen, David K.
1969 Immigrants and the Schools: A Review of Research. ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged 8 (Dec): 1-19.

Coleman, James S., et al
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Colorado Department of Education
1976 Equal Educational Opportunity, Second Annual Report.

Conroy, Hilary and T. Scott Miyakawa (eds.)
1972 East Across the Pacific. Santa Barbara, Cal.: American Bibliographical Center Clio Press.

Cortes, Carlos E.
1975 "Concepts and Strategies for Multiethnic Education". Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter 24 (Nov.): 1-4.

Drabek, Thomas E. and Judith B. Chapman
1973 "On Assessing Organizational Priorities: Concept and Method." The Sociological Quarterly 14 (Summer): 359-375.

Durin, Richard G.
1974 "The Education of Immigrants in the United States: Historical Background." Pp. 93-103 in Cave and Chesler (eds.), Sociology of Education. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Fong, Stanley L. M.
1965 "Assimilation of Chinese in America: Changes in Orientation and Social Perception." American Journal of Sociology 71 (Nov): 265-273.

Gordon, Milton
1972 "Assimilation in America: Theory and Reality." Pp. 356-374 in Hurwitz and Tesconi (eds.), Challenges to Education. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.

Gottshalk, Shimon
1973 Communities and Alternatives. New York: Schenkman Publishing Co.

Greer, Colin
1972 The Great School Legend. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Horinouchi, Isao
1967 Educational Values and Preadaptation in Acculturation of Japanese Americans. Sacramento, California: Sacramento Anthropological Society.

Hosokawa, Bill
1969 Nisei: The Quiet Americans. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Hurwitz and Tesconi (eds.)
1967 Challenges to Education. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.

Karabel, Jerome and A. H. Halsey
1977 Power and Ideology in Education. New York: Oxford University Press.

Katz, Michael B.
1971 Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Kitano, Harry H. L.
1969 Japanese Americans. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lazerson, Marvin
1975 Ethnicity and Education: Cultural Homogeneity and Conflict." ERIC Resources Information Center.

Leibowitz, Arnold H.
1971 "Educational Policy and Political Acceptance." ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.

Liu, William T. and Elena S. H. Yu
1975 "Asian-American Youth", Pp. 367-389 in Havighurst and Dreyer (ed.), Youth: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lyman, Stanford M.
1974 Chinese Americans. New York: Random House, Inc.

Meranto, Philip
1970 School Politics in the Metropolis. Columbus, Ohio. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co.

Peterson, William
1971 Japanese Americans. New York: Random House, Inc.

Schwartz, Audrey James
1970 Traditional Values and Contemporary Achievement of Japanese-American Pupils. Center for Study of Evaluation, Los Angeles, University of California (Dec).

Tyack, David B.
1967 "Becoming an American: The Education of the Immigrant." Pp. 228-263 in David B. Tyack, Turning Points in American Educational History. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co.

Vander Zanden, James W.
1965 Sociology: A Systematic Approach. New York: The Ronald Press Co.

Vander Zanden, James W.
1972 "Sources of American Minorities." Pp. 319-329 in Hurwitz and Tesconi (eds.), Challenges to Education. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.

Warren, Roland L.
1972 The Community in America. Chicago: Rand, McNally & Co.

Washburn, David E.
1975 "Ethnic Studies in the United States." Educational Leadership 32 (March): 409-412.

Wu, Cheng-Tsu (ed.)
1972 Chink! New York: World Publishing Co.